



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

thing resembling fluent melody is destructive of proper voice-production. In the famous singing-schools of Italy, in the elder days of vocal art, what the French call *la mise de voix*, or, as we roughly term it, delivery, was a study of years. Delivery consists, according to a respectable authority, "in adapting as perfectly as possible the motions of respiration to the emission of sound, so as to bring out the power of the latter, as much as the quality of the organ and the conformation of the chest will admit, without carrying it to that degree of effort which makes the sound degenerate into a cry." No singer needs to be told that these results cannot be accomplished in the singing of music constructed with little or no attention to the capabilities of the vocal organs. Wagner's carelessness in this matter has forced singers so to sin against the laws of good voice-production that only persons of unusual robustness like Materna, Lehmann, or Scaria, have been able to endure the strain long. These people, moreover, are singing actors rather than vocalists, and the extreme Wagnerites hold that in the future the singing actor must be the artist of the operatic stage. But if we had a school of composition in which the music, faithfully illustrating the truly dramatic book, should be couched in terms of fluent melody and constructed with a view to good vocal results, the kind of artist needed for the operatic stage would not be a singing actor, but an acting singer.

The world is not prepared to give up the art of finished singing. Since the days of Claudio Monteverde, the opera has been the conservatory in which blossomed the rarest flowers of song. Once let the stage lose its culture, and perfect vocalization must disappear. The concert singer and the amateur are not influential enough to counterbalance the authority of the opera. The art of *bel canto* will be lost, and we shall read of the marvellous powers of the singers of by-gone days with scepticism. Farinelli curing Philip V., of Spain, of an attack of melancholy, which threatened his reason; Raff bringing the salvation of tears to the grief-stricken Princess Belmont; Senesino forgetting his part and falling upon the neck of Farinelli after an aria; Crescentini melting Napoleon and his whole court to tears—all these things will become the incredible legends of a musical age of fable; and we shall be compelled to endure at all times, as we are now frequently, bad voice-production, harsh and unmusical declamation, and strident cries, for the sake of a particularly good facial expression and a fine dignity of movement.

W. J. HENDERSON.

### III.

#### NAMING THE NEW STATES.

SINCE the beginning of the pending discussion regarding the advisability of admitting a number of new States into the Union, a vigorous effort has been made to arouse a public sentiment hostile to the retention of the names by which several of the eligible commonwealths have been known since their organization as Territories. Mr. David Dudley Field has been foremost in this crusade against the old names, and he has apparently succeeded in convincing a portion of the press and people of the United States that it would not be advisable to have in the Union States bearing such names as North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and New Mexico. Unfortunately for his cause, however, he has not convinced the people who are most interested, the inhabitants of the territories concerned, that a change of names would be desirable; and Dakotans, Washingtonians, and New Mexicans insist with practical unanimity that the old names of their respective commonwealths be retained.

The objections to the old names, except in the case of Washington, are purely sentimental. It is urged that the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico do not sound well, and that new designations should accordingly be bestowed upon those commonwealths. The additional objection that it would be productive of confusion is urged against the name of Washington. The State of Washington and the city of Washington, say the advocates of a new nomenclature, would constantly be confounded one with the other, and it is, therefore, highly desirable that Washington Territory be admitted into the Union under some other name than that

which it bears. This is the only reason urged for a change of names, which is based upon utilitarian grounds, and it is not by any means a valid one. The fact that New York city and the State of New York bear the same name has never caused a great amount of confusion. Nobody has called for a change of name, either of the city or of the State, because of inability to distinguish between them. How much less would be the liability of confusing a city and a State separated by the width of the continent? A moment's thought will convince one how very improbable such a confusion of the State with the city would be. Indeed, the phrases of common conversation are such as to preclude the possibility of confounding Washington, the city, and Washington, the State. Confusion in the postal service because of the identity of names is equally out of the question. He would be a stupid postal clerk, indeed, who would fail to distinguish between such an address as,

*James Alexander,  
Washington,  
D. C.*

and such a one as

*James Alexander,  
Seattle.  
Wash.*

The abbreviations which are in common use, and which are authorized by the Post-Office Department, render confusion between the names of States now in the Union much more likely than would be possible between commonwealths designated by such dissimilar abbreviations as "Wash." and "D. C."

This argument, that of possible confusion, is the only one urged in favor of a change of name which is practical in its nature. The others, as has been said, are purely sentimental. North Dakota and South Dakota are objected to because of the prefixes, though nobody thinks of changing the name of North Carolina or South Carolina. New Mexico is also obnoxious because of the prefix, though the name is undeniably more appropriate and, for that matter, more euphonious, than that of New York, New Jersey, or New Hampshire. Indeed, all objections to the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico seem to be based upon an aversion to prefixes. The sentimental arguments against the name of Washington, however, are more numerous and more varied. It is urged that it is contrary to our custom to preserve the names of individuals in the names of the States of the Union. This would not be a convincing argument for changing the name of Washington, even if the assertion upon which it is based were true. As a matter of fact, however, the name of William Penn is preserved in that of Pennsylvania, the name of Charles I. in those of North Carolina and South Carolina, the name of George I. in that of Georgia, and the name of Louis XIV. in that of Louisiana. Nobody is agitating in favor of changing the names of these old commonwealths. Is it to be inferred, therefore, that this objection to the preservation of personal names does not apply to the names of French and English kings, but only to that of the American who would not be a king? Another reason urged for changing the name of Washington is that it was the wish of the forefathers to preserve the name of the Father of his Country in that of the capital city alone, and that it would be contrary to that wish for us to bestow it upon a State as well. This argument would be worthy of consideration, if it were based upon the truth, but as a matter of fact, Thomas Jefferson, as early as 1784, urged that the name of Washington be conferred upon a state of the Union.\* Surely this is sufficient warrant for the belief that those who were contemporary with Washington wished to honor his name. The only remaining argument urged against the name of Washington, and it is urged also against the names of North Dakota, South Dakota, and New Mexico, is that it does not sound as well as another name might. This is really no argument at all. It is based solely upon a question of

\* Jefferson's Report for Temporary Government of the Northwest Territory, adopted April 23, 1784.

taste, and the names which grate harshly upon the ears of Mr. Field may sound more sweetly to his fellow-citizens than those which he proposes.

It would seem that the single fact that the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and New Mexico are steadfastly opposed to any change in the names of their commonwealths would be sufficient to overbalance all of the sentimental arguments which have been urged in favor of the changes. The inhabitants of these Territories, taken altogether, number not less than twelve hundred thousand people, and their wishes on this subject have repeatedly been expressed in the most unmistakable manner. These wishes are certainly worthy of consideration. They are based upon reasons both practical and sentimental. The names now held by the Territories are interwoven with their business and social life so completely that they can never be eradicated. Banks, newspapers, manufactories, bear the names of Dakota, Washington, and New Mexico. They are trade-marks possessed of no small commercial value. But this is the least of the reasons for the opposition of the people of the Territories to the proposed change of names. The Territory of New Mexico was organized thirty-nine years ago. Washington was organized thirty-six years ago. Dakota was organized twenty-eight years ago. Children born in the Territories bearing those names have grown to manhood and womanhood, loving the commonwealths of their nativity, honoring and cherishing their names. Is it strange that these men and women should resent any attempt to obliterate the names which they have so long cherished, and to place in their stead names around which cluster no memories, names which stand for no associations? "Why," said a native of Washington Territory, "if the name of Washington was changed, I should feel as if my father's name had been taken from me. I should be like a man without a country." If the native of Massachusetts, of Connecticut, or of New York would understand this feeling, let him imagine the name of his State erased from the map and a word substituted which meant nothing to himself or to anybody else. The pride of the people of the Territories in their history and achievements is every whit as strong as that of the people of the older commonwealths, and it is not strange that they protest against the substitution of new names for the ones which their Territories have borne for so many years. Imagine the storm of indignation that would be called forth by a proposition to change the name of the State of Webster, of Clay, or of Lincoln.

The States of the Union should assuredly bear appropriate and pleasing names; but the time to bestow them is when the Territories are organized, not when the States are admitted and after names previously given have become endeared to the people.

FREDERIC JAMES GRANT.

#### IV.

##### IMPOSSIBLE PRESIDENTS.

It is apparent—to any one accustomed to inductive reasoning and capable of generalization—that no one will hereafter be elected President who has not been elected by the time he is sixty.

It is now a hundred years since Washington, at the age of fifty-seven was chosen. Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and J. Q. Adams were each elected at that same age.

Of the twenty-three Presidents, only three were elected after the age of sixty-one. Of these three, two were military men who died soon after inauguration, and the other was James Buchanan.

Eighteen of the twenty-three were elected before the age of 60, one at 50, and seven while in the forties. General Grant was 46; Mr. Cleveland, 47; and General Harrison, 55.

Unwritten law which has been solidified by time and approved by experience is most difficult of repeal! It is founded on reason. Many an aspiring statesman will beat, with bruised hands, against this law, but it will stand; and it will be as difficult for one who has passed sixty to reach the Presidency "as for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of Heaven."

S. J. WILKES.